

Att Chron

3 September 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: FY-74 KEP

STAT 1. In a meeting on 3 September 1974 with [] (OCNIO) it was learned: a) that on 29 August acting CNIO [] had requested NIOs to volunteer to prepare "Fuzzy" Performance Reports on three additional FY-74 KIQs. Due date for these additional commitments was to be 5 September; b) SEA NIO has had initial meeting on FY-74 Pilot Program Evaluation Report (a first draft is due on 5 September); c) Latin American NIO had initial meeting on 30 August (with [] in chair, group had some confusion on gain statements); d) Western Europe Asst. NIO was to draft a straw man Gain Statement this week (See [] 3 September Memo for the Record).

STAT

STAT

2. With regard to Gain Statements, pointed out to Dave that the purpose of the Baseline Report -- i.e., what we know about the KIQ, and in particular about the deficiencies -- was to define a point of reference from which newly acquired data could only be of two types--confirmatory or additional. If the latter, then it had to be either a net gain re the deficiency, or amplification of previously held information. The determination of whether it was a Gain had to be a NIO judgment. Made the point that it is in this context that the need for particularization--sub-KIQs and/or deficiencies-- becomes quite apparent.

3. Have the impression from Dave's remarks and rejoinders that NIOs would still like to see the KEP go away. This continued negative attitude is hard to understand, given Mr. Colby's unambiguous requirement for a Quantitative Evaluation System.

[]
IC/MPRRD/R&AB

STAT

STAT ee: []

3 September 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Meeting with Assistant NIO Regarding
KEP Performance Instructions

1. [redacted]
Assistant NIO for Western Europe, on 3 September 1974.
[redacted] was concerned about completing the forms for the
FY 74 KEP Pilot Program Performance Report. He asked how
the numbers on the Relative Value form were to be derived
and how the information gain statements were to be completed.

STAT 2. [redacted] stated that his KIQ was not the type of
KIQ that explicit answers could be obtained on and that
information gains would be difficult to determine. After
some discussion regarding how the Relative Value numbers
STAT could be derived and the information gain statements could
be obtained, [redacted] agreed that he would draft a response
and coordinate it with [redacted] in
turn would then coordinate with [redacted]

STAT 3. [redacted] expressed the desire that he would com-
plete the forms himself rather than meet with his community
colleagues at least in the initial draft stages. It was
impressed upon him that he should take advantage of community
participation and meet with them at some point prior to sub-
mitting his final response. [redacted] said that he would
draft the response and leave it with [redacted] to deal with,
AT since he, [redacted] would be out of town the rest of September.

[redacted]
IC/MPRRD/R&AB

STAT

cc:

[redacted]
STAT